

REMARKS

1. We thank the examiner for allowing claims 1-7, 10-11, 13, 18-19, 25, 30, 49-50, 58-59, 68, 101, 103-114, 120 and 127-138.

2. Claims 69, 102, 115-119, 121-126 and 139-175 are rejected solely on indefiniteness grounds.

The rest of our remarks are numbered to facilitate comparison to the rejection at pages 2-4.

a1 The preferably phrase (69(h)) has been deleted.

a2 69(c) now recites "an evaporator".

a3 We confirm that the "predetermined reference pressure" in claim 1 and 69 are the same. However, since claims 1 and 69 are independent in form, the replacement of "a" with --the-- does not appear appropriate.

b The "such as" phrase has been deleted from 115.

c Claims 121 and 122 now recite only "absorption", "absorber" and "absorbing".

d1-11 We have in most cases deleted the offending "the" or "said" and, where appropriate, inserted "a". However, for d10, we have made claim 172 dependent on 169 (which provides antecedent basis for "bioreactor").

e Markush language of 170 has been corrected.

f Claims 123 and 124 corrected.

g Claim 143 cancelled.

h The predetermined reference pressure of 69d-f is that first referred to in 69c. Hence, that of 151 is also that of 69c.

The British spelling "vapour" has been corrected to "vapor".

3. We thank the Examiner for noting that the statement "claim 69 has been amended" (section 2d, on page 24, of the October 2, 2007 amendment) was incorrect, claim 69 as shown on

USSN - 10/522,885

page 9 of that amendment not in fact being then amended (and thus was properly labeled as "previously presented").

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iver P. Cooper
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
IPC:lms
G:\ipc\g-i\hoib\BONDE3\bond3.ptoamend aft fnl.wpd